

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## **Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

A-S

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
	(4.0.7 公司·西西西	是"有人"。 一		pating Wiels	
<del></del>				EXAMINER	
	(M22/0316		FOREL AREA	M	
MICHAEL & BUDGELHELN MA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
2000 US HWY MUBERLY MO	63 SOUTH		1711	7	
A CONTRACT OF THE PARTY OF THE	and that there is a first		DATE MAILED:	D: 03/16/00	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit	
—The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover she	et beneath the correspondence address	
Period for Reply		THE MAILING DAT	<b>=</b>
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days.</li> <li>If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defaulter to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by</li> </ul>	, a reply within the statutory	minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  S from the mailing date of this communication.	IJ
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
and the standard CIMAI		to the marite is closed in	
Since this application is in condition for allowance ex accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle,	cept for formal matters, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.C	3. 213.	
Disposition of Claims		is/are pending in the application.	
Claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from consideration	on.
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from control	
Claim(s)			
Claim(s)		is/are rejected.	
Claim(s)		is/are objected to.	<b></b>
Claim(s)		are subject to restriction or election requirement.	OH
Application Papers			
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent D  The proposed drawing correction, filed on	rawing Review, PTO-94	8.	
The proposed drawing correction, filed on	of 1 / is Cappr	oved disapproved.	
The drawing(s) mod on	objected to by the Exan	niner.	
The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)		0(-) (-1)	
Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign price.  All Some* None of the CERTIFIED coperations.	sies of the priority docum	ients have been	
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in this national stage application from the series code/Serial received in the series code/Serial received i	the International Bureau	(PC1 Rule 1 7.2(a)).	
*Certified copies not received:			
Attachment(s)		DTO 440	
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, P	aper No(s).	Interview Summary, PTO-413	T∩_15′
Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892		Notice of Informal Patent Application, 1	
		•	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, F	PTO-948	Other	

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97) Part of Paper No.

Art Unit: 1711

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Parry et al or Carey et al taken with Wycech et al and Kagoshima et al .

The primary references disclose that it is old in the art to foam epoxy resins with the use of a blowing agent and an acid source component such as phosphoric acid as the curing agent which when the curing agent reacts with the resin an exothermic heat of reaction occurs thus volatilizing the blowing agent and foaming the resin. While these references do not show the use of a two package system employed to separate the reactants i.e. the resin and the curing agent to prevent premature reaction such system has been sold commercially for many years. In any case Wycech not only discloses such a system and additionally discloses the use the claimed expandable microspheres as foaming agents in said system. Kagoshima is cited to show that it also old in the art to add rubbers such as those claimed in claim 12 and in claim 13. Note that the recitation of the term "styrene" in claim 13 should be recited as "polystyrene". Patentees also disclose the use of expand able microspheres in their foamable composition (see col. 5 line 6 et seq. Of Kagoshima et al. It would have been well within the skill of the routineer to apply the teachings of both Wycech and Kagoshima et al to the disclosure of the primary references in the absence of unexpected results.

Art Unit: 1711

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 2. Applicants' attention is directed to the fact that there should be a clear line of distinction between the instant case and all the other cases related to the instant case, namely Ser. Nos. 081,967; 197,124; and 344,198.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Morton Foelak at telephone number (703) 308-2442.

M.F. March 14, 2000

MORTON FOELAK DRIMARY EXAMINER